‘Nothing Similar in England’: the Scottish Film Council, the Scottish Education Department and the Utility of ‘Educational Film’ to Scotland

Mandy Powell

National institutions, local networks, policy arenas and cultural distinctiveness

Media present and media past in Scotland has been characterised by asymmetrical relations of power in the nexus of the UK policy-making arena (Schlesinger, 2008, Blain, 2009). Following the 1998 devolution settlement, political oversight of media and communications remained with Westminster but oversight of culture was devolved to the Scottish Parliament. This chapter situates itself in the period between the 1930s and 1990s, the period of administrative devolution in Scotland. It will argue that cultural precipitants for political devolution developed in the conjunctions and disjunctions between film and education policy in the 1930s and then again between media and education policy in the 1970s. On both occasions, the argument for an administrative solution to the Scottish problem was felt to be the ‘least revolutionary’ option (Mitchell, 1989). By 1998, however, political devolution was conceded, possibly on the same grounds.

Scholarly work producing knowledge about feature and documentary film in Scotland[1] evolved through the twentieth century using what have become familiar disciplinary concepts (Grieveson & Wasson, 2008).[2] Historical institutional accounts of broadcasting in Scotland (McDowell, 1992, Sweeney, 2008) offer insight into Scottish institutional policy-making and

the struggle for representation in the UK arena but the early history of the Scottish Film Council (SFC), Scottish Screen's predecessor, remains relatively under-explored. Constituted as both a cultural and an educational institution, the SFC operated at the crossroads of a number of interesting policy conjunctions. This included the Scottish Education Department, a devolved power since 1707, the autonomy of which was subject to negotiation with the Privy Council until 1939 and the Scottish Office thereafter until 1998, and the British Film Institute (BFI), which was also subject to the Privy Council in the early days of its formation.

This chapter will consider the usefulness of the relationship between the Scottish Film Council and the Scottish Education Department (SED) in the argument for and efficacy of devolution. There has been little sustained analysis of the corpus of educational film in Scotland. Possibly more banal (Billig, 1995) than other filmic markers of Scottish distinctiveness, 21,308 educational films had been borrowed from Scotland's 'regional' film library, the Scottish Central Film Library (SCFL), by 1941[3]. This chapter suggests that the work educational film performed had a double utility in that it made visible a cultural particularity upon which contracts for devolved powers in both film and education arenas were negotiated by policy-makers and upon which the continued legitimacy of Scottish institutions relied. The history of the Scottish Film Council (SFC), and arguably Scottish Cinema, is inextricably bound to the history of Scottish Education and the history of devolution in Scotland. Everyday devolutionary practices, situated in the politics of cultural difference in the nexus of continuously shifting spaces and places of power, created an infrastructure that would scaffold a precarious filmmaking community in the address of 'the Scottish problem' (Mitchell, 1989).

The SFC was formally constituted in Glasgow in 1934.[4] Established in the year following the formation of the British Film Institute (BFI), the identity of the SFC as a national

institution, rather than a regional film office, was navigated from the outset with the help of the Association of Directors of Education in Scotland (ADES), an influential group of Scottish educationists (McPherson and Raab, 1988). ADES was a professional body representing the newly organised local education authorities. Before ADES emerged in 1920, the administration of Scottish Education by the London-based Scotch Education Department (SED) was operationalised by the Schools Inspectorate (HMI) (Humes, 2000, 1986). ADES offered a potentially democratic element to the governance of Scottish Education and together with HMI provided powerful central stewardship.

The Scottish Educational Film Association (SEFA) was the second key local intermediary. Comprising 5,000 teacher members from across Scotland (Barclay, 1993) SEFA encouraged the teaching workforce to engage with film in all its emergent forms. SEFA's advocacy positioned film as 'useful' (Acland & Wasson, 2011; Hediger & Vondereau, 2009) in and for Scotland and, therefore, as public good.

Problem Scotland: devolution, devolution, devolution

Successive political, economic and cultural policy failures to address Scottish particularity frames Scotland as a problem space. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century the 'problem' was primarily considered in terms of proximity. Difficult to administrate at such a distance, the re-organisation and re-location of the Scottish Office to Edinburgh was regarded as the 'least revolutionary' of the alternatives that included Home Rule or 'complete absorption and anglicisation' (Mitchell, 1989). Mass unemployment in the 1930s was regarded as a distinctive Scottish problem stemming from an over-reliance in west-central Scotland on a narrow industrial sector. The failure of Whitehall to implement the Scottish Office's recommendation at the time to diversify regional industrial production until the

1960s and focus instead on alleviating unemployment through social expenditure was suggestive of a bigger problem (Campbell, 1979). Political devolution had been under discussion since at least the 1920s but the merger between the National Party of Scotland, formed in 1928, and the Scottish Party, formed in 1932, establishing the Scottish National Party in 1934, led to a solution widely described as 'administrative devolution' (Cameron, 2010, Mitchell, 2009).

Political oversight of Scottish culture was not devolved to the Scottish Parliament until the 1998 settlement. However, Gardiner (2004) roots the emergence of a rationale for cultural devolution in the distinctiveness of Scottish Education and its promotion of civic identity. The concept of democratic intellectualism was deployed by Walter Elliot in 1932, a Secretary of State for Scotland who appointed the first Films of Scotland Committee in 1938, to describe Scottish Education as a heritage where 'discipline is rigidly and ruthlessly enforced but where criticism and attack are unflinching, continuous and salt with a bitter and jealous humour. It is a heritage wherein intellect, speech and, above all, argument are the passports to the highest eminence in the land' (Elliot 1932: p64). Elliot was highly critical of 'merely utilitarian education' and advocated a technical education that should show 'industrial capacity has an intellectual side'. It was in this context the constitution of the Scottish Film Council was negotiated.

One month before the Scottish Independence Referendum in 2014, James Robertson, author of *The Testament of Gideon Mack* (2006), *And The Land Lay Still* (2011) and *The News Where You Are*, (2014), described his struggle to construct a narrative history of devolution in Scotland. Imagined by him initially as a phenomenon rooted in the 1950s, Robertson was surprised to locate his starting point in the 1920s. For James Mitchell (2009), the modern concept of devolution emerged in the late nineteenth century, driven by 'a

growing body of Scots [who] felt that Scottish distinctiveness was being ignored' (19). Mitchell describes devolution at this time as an administrative solution to a political problem that had

> both a symbolic and a substantive function. Symbolically, it represented recognition by government at the centre that Scotland was different. Substantively, it developed a considerable range of responsibilities… (17)

The capacity of this new office of central government came under increasing scrutiny as the twentieth century evolved. Its efficacy was challenged publically in 1979 when the first devolution referendum was held. The UK government moved to constrain the outcome of that referendum and despite a result narrowly in favour of political devolution - 51.6% voted yes and 48.8% voted no - it failed to meet the requirement for 40% of the electorate. Eighteen years later, the 1998 devolution referendum result was 74.3% and 25.7% respectively (Hutchison, 2001).

Media, education and the public sphere

John Reith and John Grierson explicitly articulated a purposive relationship between media, education and the public sphere in their visions for radio broadcasting and documentary film respectively. However, Grierson's claim to have organised an 'educational revolution' (1990) in the process is questionable. The social purpose of publicly funded broadcasting in Britain is declared through its three principles, to educate, inform and entertain. Sufficient definitional vagueness facilitates an arguably useful classificatory blurring that relegates education to a service role on the periphery of disciplinary interest. Film and media theory in

Britain has yet to evidence the educational work film and broadcasting performs yet its aesthetic and production culture has been condemned to the wastelands of instrumentality and propaganda respectively. By contrast, Maija Runcis and Bengt Sandin's (2010) study of educational broadcasting in Sweden takes a multidisciplinary approach and offers a compelling rationale for the value of such work. Concluding that educational broadcasting provided a 'forum for negotiation for a number of interested parties' (172), the book's title, *Neither Fish Nor Fowl*, captures the dilemma well.

Very little research has been undertaken in the UK regarding the classification of 'educational film' or its utility. Scholarly work on the corpus of industrial film in Europe (Hediger & Vondereau, 2009) and the cultural utility of 'other' cinema (Acland & Wasson, 2011) analyses the everyday work of film culture and argues that the strategic weakness of form re-focuses the analysis on the job of work film was made to do. Zoe Druick's (2008, 2011) work on education and film in The League of Nations and UNESCO draws a similar conclusion. When writing about 'non-canonised' (Elsaesser 2009: 26) film, the idea of focusing 'on a specific location, a professional association, or even a national or state initiative' (22) in the context of this edited collection on regional media aesthetics is helpful. Elsaesser's case for a broader research agenda that incorporates film history in media archeology is also pertinent in this context.

In her work on industrial film, Yvonne Zimmerman discusses the fruitfulness of analysing industrial film as 'a media practice that focuses on its function as utility film' (2009: 102). She quotes the head of Condor Documentaries in the 1980s who claimed 'What Hollywood is to America, the corporate film is to Switzerland' (102). The Scottish Film Council's historical association with the Scottish Education Department and the work of the Scottish Educational Film Association (SEFA) was marginalised by film and media scholars in the

1970s. Such judgments have elided the political, social and cultural work educational film performed in and for Scotland.

The constitution of the SFC in 1934 was an event that both consolidated and institutionalised the use and production of educational film in Scotland. In the politics of what has been termed a 'renaissance' of Scottish film culture (Petrie 2000) and in the media education moment of the 1980s, the history of the SFC in general and Scottish educational film in particular was constructed as problematic. In *Scotland the Movie* (1996), a former Director of the SFC, David Bruce, described the relationship between Scottish Cinema and Scottish Education as 'politically grey' and 'complex' (p136). Bruce's compendium of film in Scotland was published in 1996, a year before the second devolution referendum in 1997 and the re-casting of the SFC as Scottish Screen (SED, 1988). More than a decade later, in a chapter on the early history of film in *The Media in Scotland* (Blain et al, 2008), Bruce identifies a number of influences informing this period until fiction film became 'the main mode of Scottish Cinema'. Bruce made mention of documentary production but no trace of educational film is evident. All reference to the production of educational film in Scotland had faded from 'grey' to invisible. However, if analysis of the work of educational film is scant in Scottish film histories, accounts of its contribution in histories of Scottish education are equally difficult to find.

Glasgow puts educational film to work

Glasgow Corporation's education officials were particularly successful in promoting the use of film both inside and outside the classroom in the 1930s (Lebas, 2011). The development of a systematised service in Scotland created the space for Glasgow Corporation to raise its profile. Some of the Corporation's teachers and founding members of the Film Society of Glasgow (1929), and the newly appointed Director of Education for Glasgow (R. M. Allardyce), founded the Scottish Educational Cinema Society (SECS) in 1930.[5] The Chair of the Corporation's Education Committee, Charles Cleland, was SECS Honorary President. Charles Cleland had held a number of elected positions within the Corporation since 1891. He was also a member of the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films set up by the British Institute for Adult Education. Its report, *The Film in National Life* (Gott, 1932) was the impetus for establishing the British Film Institute in 1933. Cleland later became a Governor and acting chair of the BFI. Both Allardyce and Cleland were committed to the use of film for civic purposes. Importantly, Allardyce had considerable influence on the Scottish Education Department in the inter-war years not least because 'In a country the size of Scotland, you cannot afford to ignore one fifth, which is Glasgow' (McPherson & Raab, 1988, p449).

The dual membership of committees across administrative jurisdictions enabled officials to practice navigating the line between forging a distinctive Scottish particularity at local level and the concern of the Scottish Office to maintain British uniformity. Scottish Education's distinctiveness, according to Robert Anderson (2003) and David McCrone (2003), is a marker of national identity robustly defended against assimilation with England. Lindsay Paterson (1997) argues that this process of 'negotiating' autonomy from the UK required the practice of 'pragmatic nationalism' whereby devolved powers were conditional on the basis of sufficient but not excessive difference.

The *Glasgow Herald* reported the Corporation's early experiments with the 'teaching film'.[6] The availability of educational film up to this point was limited to what was being produced in the US and didn't meet the needs of Scottish classrooms. Described as a 'didactic instrument' the educative or 'teaching' film, also termed 'scholastic',[7] had a different purpose to the looser category of educational film.[8] The teaching film was required to 'avoid cheap humour', use repetition, slow motion and 'continuous shots' (The Glasgow Herald, 1931). By contrast, educational film, or the 'background film' (educative film foregrounded pedagogy) was 'material, narrative, scenic or descriptive' and held to be particularly valuable for 'cinema children' who 'showed greater understanding of the work done than those who had to rely only on other means'[9]. The work educational film performed for literacy development therefore, thus linked explicitly with 'equal opportunities' (SFC & SEFA, 1940)[10]. At that time, local education authorities were in the process of constructing a contemporary model of education that would be fit for an industrial twentieth century. The support of the emerging middle-classes for the provision of a universal public education system that widened access and increased participation was vital. The use of new film technologies and texts in Scotland's classrooms, therefore, was important to the myth of Scotland's 'democratic intellectualism' and, thus, a distinction that would frame Scottish Education as different from that on offer elsewhere in the UK. Non-fiction film in general and educational film in particular, therefore, was put to work in pursuit of this objective.

The east coast rival to the Educational Cinema Society was formed in Edinburgh in 1933 (Barclay, 1993). The Scottish Educational Sight and Sound Association (SESSA) needed to position itself differently, and declared an interest in both sound and visual technologies in education. The west coast cousin had tried to persuade them to form an east coast branch of the Educational Cinema Society rather than form a separate organisation. There were substantive areas of disagreement between these two associations, however.[11] The Glasgow

based Educational Cinema Society opposed the use of sound film in the classroom on both technological and aesthetic grounds. For SECS, cinema was an emergent form, the potential of which may have been compromised by sound. Sound projectors were also more expensive and less accessible. The Edinburgh based Sight & Sound Association, on the other hand, were opposed to the Educational Cinema Society's involvement in the making of educational films. SESSA were concerned that SECS members were paying more attention to making films than they were paying to the pedagogy of film. According to SESSA, making films was the province of the film trade alone. A tension between filmmaker and educationist emerged in Edinburgh that was not apparent in Glasgow. The film critic, Forsyth Hardy, and associate and biographer of Grierson, was an influential member of the Edinburgh Film Guild, and may have contributed to this tension. The first Films of Scotland Committee did not convene until 1938 and Hardy referred to this early period as 'the battle over control of educational film development'.[12]

In public discourse, while the 'teaching film' did the work of legitimising the use of film in the classroom, education researchers in Scotland were also interested in children's popular cultural tastes and preferences and the use of the 'background film' and the 'entertainment film'. Both Edinburgh and Glasgow city councils undertook research into children, young people and the cinema.[13] The Director of Education in Edinburgh, J. D. Frizzell, was also an influential figure in the administration of Scottish Education. Allardyce had the ear of the Scottish Education Department but Frizzell led the Association of Directors of Education. The Edinburgh study was part of a wider programme of social enquiry looking at children's attendance at the cinema in the UK (Smith, 2005).

The Glasgow study, on the other hand, underway at the same time, and described by the Glasgow Herald as 'An Aid to Backward Children',[14] focused on the potential of film for

progressing learning. Other research such as the Middlesex Experiment (Richards, 2010) had established the case for general interest or background films, but the Glasgow experiment was keen to understand 'the effect of using film regularly as an integral part of the teacher's stock-in-trade'.[15] The Edinburgh study legitimised children's popular cultural tastes and preferences whilst the Glasgow study legitimised the pedagogy of film. School cinemas also screened popular 'entertainment' films for children; the first school in Glasgow to install a cinema was in 1931 in the Gorbals, an area with acute socio-economic challenges.[16] Teachers accompanying children to commercial cinemas for matinee performances scheduled during the school day was also encouraged as well as attendance at the matinee programmes on Saturdays.

A new industry: the construction of (just enough) difference

Following the emergence of the British Film Institute in 1933, the Directors of Education in Glasgow and Edinburgh, together with Charles Cleland who would bring his experience of the BFI negotiations to bear, organised a conference of 'educational bodies, film societies and other organisations interested in the film in Scotland'.[17] For the educationists in particular, it was the 'heterogeneous combination of film societies',[18] rather than the trade, who gave the greatest concern. The invitations to sit on the initial organising committee, issued by the educationists, betray unease about the activities of the film societies in Scotland. The aim of the conference was to form a Scottish National Film Council. Cooperation between those interested in the educational, cultural, artistic, industrial and commercial possibilities of film was deemed preferable to the fracturing of Scottish interest. Agreement between the parties involved was struck on the basis that partnership with the Institute was financially desirable but the extent of the Institute's cultural and educational influence in Scotland would need to

be constrained. The main advantage of partnership arrangements with the Institute was 'to share in the more tangible of its assets which would be derived from English sources'[19] (although in the event, those assets were more imagined than real). What emerges subsequently is a Scottish National Film Council that, like Scottish Education, was administratively devolved. The overriding desire for Scottish national autonomy brought the different interest groups together, acting as a galvanizing force in a way not evident in the formation of the BFI. Establishing the Scottish Film Council as distinctive secured its administrative autonomy from the British Film Institute as well as enhancing the distinctiveness of Scottish Education. The interests of the statutory sector were secured when the west coast Educational Cinema Society and the east coast Educational Sight and Sound Association merged to form a new professional association: the Scottish Educational Film Association (SEFA).

By 1938, SEFA had 5,000 members, calculated by Trevor Griffiths (2013), to constitute 18% of the teaching workforce. More significantly for policy discourse there was no equivalent English association. SEFA established an experimental filmmaking group who used colour filters, exposure meters and animation.[20] Teachers who didn't have the time (or inclination) to make films themselves submitted treatments/scenarios for the filmmaking group to produce.[21] SEFA organised study circles, film weekends and summer schools, and held projector demonstrations in schools in Glasgow, where 1,000 teachers were reported to have attended in just one week for instruction in the use of projectors. ADES requested that SEFA's Film School be acknowledged as a qualification credential (Barclay, 1993).

In 1938, SEFA had also organised 32 matinees in 41 theatres for a total audience of 80,000 and put together age-appropriate programmes to help guide cinema programmers. SEFA had also instituted the Film Reviewing Scheme,[22] and it was noted 'arrangements in

England were to be brought into line'.[23] This involved 70 study groups and 1,000 teachers who developed a grading system for educational films. In 1938, Edinburgh's Director of Education became president of SEFA. In 1940, the Scottish Film Council and the Scottish Educational Film Association jointly authored a *Report by the Advisory Committee on the General Principles Governing the Production of Educational Films (With Lists of Subjects For Films)* published by the University of London Press Ltd.

By 1944, the Director of Education in Edinburgh asserted 'the time is past when for realism one must go to the documentary and for drama to the popular film. Both schools of filmmaking are now reacting on one another'.[24] SEFA declared the cinema to be a respectable social activity at the same time as advocating its use for educational purposes in the classroom. Its members organised exhibitions and demonstrations of film technology and raised the profile of film amongst this new professional class, as well as the profile of the SFC in its early years.

Films of Scotland v Educational Films of Scotland: Hardy wins the battle (and the SFC gets a bloody nose)

Importantly, SEFA was responsible for the significant improvement in the Scottish Council's finances, not least upon the opening of the Scottish Central Film Library in Glasgow in 1939. Russell Borland, a founding member of the Educational Cinema Society and the SFC's first employee, had encouraged amateur production groups to make local films that would not be viable commercially. Many of these were then made available through the Central Film Library.

This period of the Council's history illustrates the extent to which the interests of both the Department and the Council had become inextricably linked since its formation in 1934. The National Committee for Visual Aids in Education was set up as a UK body in 1946. For Scotland, the option of seeking Scottish representation on the UK body was not sufficiently attractive because 'on questions of film production there is likely to be a divergence of view between Scotland and England, and experience suggests that the views of a Scottish minority might have little chance of materially influencing policy' (SED, 1950). The view that Scotland had made significant advances and that SEFA was already doing the work proposed for the UK body prompted the Scottish Education Department to fund the establishment of a Joint Production Committee (JPC) to be administered by the SFC and SEFA. In 1962 this would become Educational Films of Scotland (EFS).[25]

The JPC would 'deal with the production of films which might be sponsored by the government' (Barclay, 1993). Its creation as a source of government funding for the production of Scottish film was reported in the Daily Record in 1950; 'Quietly, without fuss, a minor Scottish film industry is under way with the production of short documentaries and interest films for school children'.[26] Meantime, films circulated by the Central Film Library during the war had worn-out and projectors were in short supply. The Library had been self-supporting from 1939 until 1949 but could not supply the increased demand following the war. The reputation of Scotland in the field had developed nationally and with the establishment of the Edinburgh International Festival in 1947, it began to develop further afield. Keen to protect its jealously guarded asset, the Scottish Education Department continued to fund the Library's operational costs. By 1948 the Department had agreed to provide the funding for 'additional assistance' to the work of the Library, enabling it to purchase new stock from British production companies and to oversee the work of the JPC.

However, in 1947, the Council lost Borland, its then Director, to Gaumont British Instructional Films and the search for his replacement was on. Concerns from the filmmaking community about the Council's relationship with the statutory sector re-emerged. Forsyth Hardy re-stated his objection to the dominance of educational film in the Council's activity. Such a policy had, according to the film society movement, been hijacked by the drive to produce and distribute educational film in Scotland. In light of the forthcoming Radcliffe Report, a change of emphasis was required. Eventually, this would result in increased funding for the Council by the Institute, and Hardy became the Director of the re-convened Films of Scotland Committee from 1954-1974.

Although the Council had effectively been operating as an educational institution until this point, it had not been constituted as such. Two significant and shared assets, the Central Film Library and the JPC, represented the vested interests of SEFA and the Film Council. Frizell, still Director of Education in Edinburgh with considerable influence in the Department, had positions in the Council, in SEFA, in SCFL and the JPC. The work of educational film had brought Scottish educational and cultural particularity to new audiences and represented a significant asset in the context of its constitutional relationship within the UK. In the same way, therefore, as Frizell managed the setting up of the Council in 1934, he managed the negotiation of the Council's transition to charitable status in 1950. The Film Library was appointed as the official agent for the distribution of films to Scottish schools, the operating costs to be met by the Department, but as an asset and as a title, the Film Library was transferred to the Council. Frizell's influence continued to be key to the survival of both the Scottish Film Council's autonomy from the British Film Institute and the Scottish Education Department's international reputation until his retirement in 1961.

The emergence of the new culture and technology of film created a productive coalition of interest amongst educationists, the film trade and the new local government structures emerging in urban Scotland in the 1930s. Those alliances in pursuit of social change were particularly empowering in the cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh and enabled a fledgling national film agency to support the trade by facilitating the development of product, technology and audiences at a local level. The work educational film performed in the first half of the twentieth century in Scotland constituted film and cinema as public good and public service. Imagined by the British Film Institute (BFI) as a regional office to 'fill any vital gaps',[27] at the Scottish Film Council's (SFC) eighth Annual General Meeting in 1941, the then Director of the British Film Institute (BFI), Oliver Bell, claimed that 'in Scotland far more than in England the film was playing an ever increasing and useful part in the life of the community'.[28]

Between 1950 and 1974, however, the SFC struggled to channel the distinctiveness and utility of either Scottish film culture or Scottish education into a significant contribution towards changing technological, cultural, economic and political landscapes in the UK and Europe.[29] In 1974, the SFC was re-constituted under the umbrella of a new Scottish institution: the Scottish Council for Educational Technology (SCET). For the then Director of the SFC and the Scottish Central Film Library (SCFL), Ronnie Macluskie, this offered a number of new opportunities to address arguably more pressing concerns, but the development was viewed with disdain by the Scottish film-making community.

Throughout the 1970s in Scotland, questions of representation and accountability were emerging in political, economic, administrative and cultural domains. Such questions exposed the failure of administrative devolution to address the constitutional problematic of a 'stateless nation' (McCrone, 1992) particularly during a period of profound societal change.

At this time, Scotland's institutions were failing to put its particularity to work *for* Scotland and its license to devolved powers was thus put at risk.

Betwixt and Between: the spaces and places for practising everyday distinctiveness

This chapter has not attempted to combine spatial and temporal signifiers to distil a national essence.[30] Instead, it has explored how analytical history (Tosh, 2006) makes more visible the process of negotiating everyday distinctiveness in the flows of power between nations, regions and cities through space and time. Scholars in the political and social sciences point to the manifest acceleration of support for political devolution in Scotland as an increasingly more viable solution to local economic, social and cultural issues than its administrative predecessor could provide.[31] The term itself did acquire more substantive conceptual value as the decade unfolded. However, a binocular lens that explicitly links media and education policy across the twentieth century in Scotland affords a better understanding of devolution as a cultural practice enacted in the politics of space and place.

The decision to separate media and communications from culture in the second 1998 devolution referendum settlement may not have been a wise decision in a constitutive moment (Hampton, 2005). The potential for social and political change lies in the distinctiveness of cultural practices enacted in the everyday conjunctions and disjunctions forged between spaces and places; and between jurisdictions, national institutions, local networks and policy arenas in a converged media environment. At the time of writing, the first 2014 independence referendum in Scotland returned a majority in support of the continuation of political devolution. Whether that will be judged to have been the 'least revolutionary' option remains to be seen but as a solution to the problem of Scotland, its time may have been called.

Notes

[1] For a polemical critique of representations of Scotland on screen see McArthur, C. (ed.) (1982) *Scotch Reels: Scotland in Cinema & Television*. London: BFI and the debates that followed. Also see McIntyre, S (1984 & 1985) in *Screen*, vols. 25:1 & 26:1 respectively. For a historical overview of film and television in Scotland see Petrie, D. (2000) *Screening Scotland. An Extensive Research Guide to Scottish Cinema* and Murray, J (2005) *That Thinking Feeling: A Research Guide to Scottish Cinema 1938-2004*. Edinburgh/Glasgow: Edinburgh College of Art/Scottish Screen. For documentary, a historical overview can be found in Blain, N. (1990) *A Scotland As Good As Any Other? Documentary Film 1937-82*, in Dick, E. (ed.) *From Limelight to Satellite: A Scottish Film Book*. Scottish Film Council & British Film Institute. An account of the formation of the Films of Scotland Committee is given in Butts, R (1996) 'The Films of Scotland Documentaries: Cultural Formations and Institutional Constraints', *Media Education Journal*, No. 20, 25-28. Detailed analysis of the work of the Films of Scotland Committee can be found in Butts, R (1996) 'History, Ethnography and the Nation…' (see bibliography). Accounts of two particular documentary film makers can be found in McBain, J. & Cowle, K. (1997) *With An Eye To The Future': Donald Alexander & Budge Cooper - Documentary Film Makers*. Glasgow: Scottish Screen.

[2] For work on 'becoming' an academic discipline see Goodson, I (1981) Becoming an Academic Subject: Patterns of Explanation and Evolution in *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 163-180.

[3] SEFA. Educational Film Bulletin, June 1943. SSA: 1/5/223. National Library of Scotland.

[4] SFC. Minute of First General Meeting of the Scottish Film Council. September 1934. SSA: 1/5/250. National Library of Scotland.

[5] Glasgow Herald. Films for the Schoolroom: New Scottish Society's Aims, 18 May, 1931, p9c. Mitchell Library, Glasgow.

[6] The Film in the Classroom, Glasgow Corporation Education Department, 1933. SSA 1/1/237.

[7] SFC. Minute of First General Meeting of the Scottish Film Council. September 1934. SSA: 1/5/250.

[8] ''Educational' for the purposes of such a library [SCFL] should be interpreted in the broadest sense, and to some it would seem that one of the principal functions of the Scottish Central Library should be to build up a collection of films which illustrate the life and work and spirit of Scotland itself'. The Cinema And The Teacher: A Year's Progress. Norman Wilson. Source unknown. c1940. SSA. The difference between 'educative' and 'educational' broadcasting was described in the 1966 BBC report *Educational Television and Radio in Britain: A New Phase in Education*.

[9] Glasgow Corporation Report 1931-32. Mitchell Library.

[10] See work in New Literacy Studies emerging in the 1990s in the UK for a more contemporary frame.

[11] SESSA. File of correspondence. SSA: 1/10/28. National Library of Scotland.

[12] H Forsyth Hardy. Letter to RB Macluskie, 14 July 1976. SSA: 1/2/95. National Library of Scotland.

[13] Glasgow Corporation Education Department. *The Film in the Classroom*. 1933. Glasgow: The Corporation of Glasgow Education Department. Mackie, J (1933) *The Edinburgh Cinema Enquiry*. Edinburgh: The Edinburgh Cinema Enquiry Committee

[14] Glasgow Herald. 'An Aid To Backward Children: Educational Value Proved', 16 December 1931, p7b. Mitchell Library, Glasgow.

[15] *The Film in the Classroom*, Glasgow Corporation Education Department, 1933. SSA 1/1/237. National Library of Scotland.

[16] Glasgow Herald. 'Glasgow School's Lead: Films for Educational Purposes', 28 May 1931, p7d. Mitchell Library, Glasgow.

[17] The Scotsman. 'Scots Film Council: To be Integral Part of British Institute: Autonomy Safeguard', June 1934. SSA: 1/1/237. National Library of Scotland.

[18] Allardyce, RM. Letter to East Lothian County Council, June 22 1934. SSA: 1/1/237. National Library of Scotland.

[19] The Scotsman. 'Scots Film Council: To be Integral Part of British Institute: Autonomy Safeguard', June 1934. SSA: 1/1/237. National Library of Scotland.

[20] SEFA. Handbook of the Scottish Educational Film Association 1937-1938. SSA: 1/5/162. National Library of Scotland.

[21] SEFA. Minutes of the Scottish Educational Cinema Society. Glasgow Branch. April 1935-April 1936. SSA: 1/5/8. National Library of Scotland.

[22] SFC. Minute of the Seventh Meeting. 04 September 1935. SSA:1/1/250. National Library of Scotland.

[23] SFC. Minute of the Education Panel. 31 January 1936. SSA: 1/1/247. National Library of Scotland.

[24] Frizell, JB. The Cinema As a Social Force. SSA: 1/5/155-160. National Library of Scotland.

[25] Educational Films of Scotland would provide much needed work for Scottish film production crews e.g. Bill Forsyth in 1964.

[26] Daily Record. 'The Schools Will Be In Luck', December 15, 1950, p4. SSA: 1/1/60. National Library of Scotland.

[27] The Scotsman. 'Scots Film Council: To be Integral Part of British Institute: Autonomy Safeguard', June 1934. SSA: 1/1/237. National Library of Scotland.

[28] SFC. Minutes of the Eighth Annual General Meeting, 29 October 1941. SSA: 1/1/251. National Library of Scotland.

[29] See Powell, M (2010) 'The Origins and Development of Media Education in Scotland'. Stirling: University of Stirling (unpublished PhD). .

[30] Scholars point to a shift away from a concern with the essence of national representations. See Neely, S (2005) 'Scotland, Heritage and Devolving British Cinema' in *Screen*, 46:2, 241-5 and Neely, S (2008) Contemporary Scottish Cinema in Blain, N & Hutchison, D (eds.) *The Media in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

[31] See Cameron (2010), Mitchell (2009), Paterson, L (1994) *The Autonomy of Modern Scotland*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press; Midwinter, Keating & Mitchell (1991) *Politics and Public Policy in Scotland*. London: MacMillan; and Kellas, J. G. (1975) *The Scottish Political System: Second Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press**.** Also see Bechhofer, F & McCrone, D (eds.) (2009) *National Identity, Nationalism and Constitutional Change*. London: Palgrave Macmillan; and McCrone (1992), in McCrone, Kendrick & Straw (eds.) (1989) *The Making of Scotland: Nation, Culture & Social Change*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bibliography

Acland, C. & Wasson, H. (2011) *Useful Cinema*. (London: Duke University Press).

Anderson, R. (2003) The History of Scottish Education. In T. G. K. Bryce & W. M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education: Second Edition, Post-Devolution*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).

Archer, J. (2014) 'Commentary: Unlocking Potential, Embracing Ambition', *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 23, No. 3, 193-196.

Barclay, J. B. (1993) *The Film in Scottish Schools*. (Edinburgh: Private Publication).

Billig, M. (1995) *Banal Nationalism*. (London: Sage).

Blain, N. & Hutchison, D. (eds.) (2008) *The Media in Scotland*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).

Blain, N. (2009) The Scottish Dimension in Film and Television. In K. Veitch (ed.) *Scottish Life and Society: Transport and Communications. A Compendium of Scottish Ethnology*, Vol. 8. (Edinburgh: Birlin) (Imprint: John Donald in association with the European Ethnological Research Centre), 768-792.

Bolas, T. (2009) *Screen Education: From Film Appreciation to Media Studies*. (Bristol: Intellect).

Bruce, D (2008) The History of Film and Cinema. In N. Blain & D. Hutchison (eds.), *The Media in Scotland*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), 71-86.

Bruce, D. (1996) *Scotland the Movie*. (Edinburgh: Polygon).

Butt, R. (1996) *History, Ethnography and The Nation: The Films of Scotland Documentaries*. Edinburgh: Queen Margaret University (unpublished PhD thesis)

Butts, R. (1997) Critique of the Film: Wealth of a Nation. In J. McBain & K. Cowle (eds.) *'With an Eye to the Future': Donald Alexander and Budge Cooper - documentary film makers*. (Glasgow: Scottish Screen), 17-22.

Cameron, E. A. (2010) *Impaled Upon A Thistle: Scotland Since 1880*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).

Campbell, R. H. (1979) 'The Scottish Office and the Special Areas in the 1930s', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 1, 167-183.

Druick, Z. (2011) UNESCO, Film and Education: Mediating Postwar Paradigms of Communication. In C. Acland & H. Wasson (eds.), *Useful Cinema*. (London: Duke University Press), 81-102.

Elliot, W. (1932) 'The Scottish Heritage in Politics' in His Grace the Duke of Atholl et al., *A Scotsman's Heritage.* (London: Alexander MacLehose & Co.), 53-65.

Elsaesser, T. (2009) The Place of Non-Fiction Film in Contemporary Media. In V. Hediger & P. Vondereau (eds.), *Films That Work: Industrial Film and the Productivity of Media*. (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press), 19-34.

Gardiner, M. (2004) *The Cultural Roots of British Devolution*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).

Glasgow Herald (1931) Glasgow Schools Lead: Films for Educational Purposes, May 28, 1931, p7d.

Gott, B. S. (1932) *The Film in National Life: Report of an enquiry conducted by the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films into the service which the cinematograph may render to education and social progress*. (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.).

Grierson, J. (1990) *Eyes of Democracy*. Occasional Papers No. 3. (University of Stirling: The John Grierson Archive).

Grieveson, L. & Wasson, H. (eds.) (2008) *Inventing Film Studies*. (London: Duke University Press).

Griffiths, T. (2013) *The Cinema and Cinema-Going in Scotland, 1896-1950*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).

Hampton, M. (2005) 'Review Essay: Media Studies and the Mainstreaming of Media History' *Media History*, Vol. 11, No. 3, 239-246.

Hediger, V. & Vondereau, P. (eds.) (2009) *Films That Work: Industrial Film and the Productivity of Media*. (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press).

Humes, W. (2000) State: The Governance of Scottish Education 1872-2000. In H. Holmes (ed.), *Scottish Life and Society: Education*. *A Compendium of Scottish Ethnology*, Vol. 11. (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press), 84-105.

Humes, W. (1986) *The Leadership Class in Scottish Education*. (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd.).

Hunter, A. (1990) Bill Forsyth: The Imperfect Anarchist. In E. Dick (ed.), *From Limelight to Satellite: A Scottish Film Book*. (London: Scottish Film Council & British Film Institute), 151–162.

Hutchison, I. G. C (2001) *Scottish Politics in the Twentieth Century*. (Basingstoke: Palgrave).

Lebas, E. (2011) *Forgotten Futures: British Municipal Cinema 1920-1980*. (London: Black Dog Publishing).

McCrone, D. (1992) *Understanding Scotland: The Sociology of a Nation*. (London: Routledge).

McCrone, D. (2003) Culture, Nationalism & Scottish Education: homogeneity & diversity. In T. G. K. Bryce & W. M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education: Second Edition, Post-Devolution*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), 239-249.

McDowell, W. H. (1992) *The History of BBC Broadcasting in Scotland 1923-1983*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).

McPherson, A. & Raab, C. (1988) *Governing Education: A Sociology of Policy Since 1945*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).

Miller, W (1985) Politics in the Scottish City 1832-1982. In G. Gordon (ed.), *Perspectives of the Scottish City*. (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press), 180-211.

Mitchell, J. (2009) *Devolution in the UK*. (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Mitchell, J. (1989) 'The Gilmour report on Scottish central administration' *Juridical Review*, Vol. 34, No. 2, 173-188.

Murray, J. (2011) *Studies in the History and Culture of Scotland. Volume 4: Discomfort and Joy: The Cinema of Bill Forsyth*. (Bern: Peter Lang AG).

Paterson, L. (1997) Policy-making in Scottish education: a case of pragmatic nationalism. In M. Clark & P. Munn (eds.), *Education in Scotland: from pre-schools to secondary*. (London: Routledge), 138-155.

Petrie, D. (2000) *Screening Scotland*. (London: BFI Publishing).

Richards, J. (2010) *The Age of The Dream Palace: Cinema & Society in 1930s Britain*. (London: IB Tauris).

Robertson, J. (2006) *The Testament of Gideon Mack*. (London: Penguin).

Robertson, J. (2011) *And the Land Lay Still*. (London: Penguin).

Robertson, J. (2014) *The News Where You Are*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZhL57cjN8xY

Robertson, R. (1992) *Globalisation: Social Theory and Global Culture*. (London: Sage).

Runcis, M. & Sandin, B. (2010) *Neither Fish Nor Fowl: Educational Broadcasting in Sweden 1930-2000*. (Lund: Nordic Academic Press).

Schlesinger, P. (2008) Communications Policy. In N. Blain & D. Hutchison (eds.), *The Media in Scotland*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), 35-51.

SED (1950) *Visual and Aural Aids: A Report of the Advisory Council on Education in Scotland*. Edinburgh: HMSO

SED (1988) *Scottish Film Council: report of policy review and implementation plan*. Scottish Education Department.

SFC & SEFA (1940) *Report by the Advisory Committee on the General Principles Governing the Production of Educational Films (With Lists of Subjects For Films)*. (London: University of London Press Ltd).

Smith, S. J. (2005) *Children, Cinema & Censorship: From Dracula to the Dead End Kids*. (London: IB Tauris).

Sweeney, M. (2008) Broadcasting: From Birth to Devolution … and Beyond. In N. Blain & D. Hutchison (eds.), *The Media in Scotland*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), 87-103.

Tosh, J. (2006) *The Pursuit of History: Aims, methods and new directions in the study of modern history*. Fourth Edition with Sean Lang. (Harlow: Pearson Longman).

Zimmerman, Y. (2009) 'What Hollywood Is to America, the Corporate Film Is to Switzerland': Remarks on Industrial Film as Utility Film. In V. Hediger & P. Vondereau (eds.), *Films That Work: Industrial Film and the Productivity of Media.* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press), 101-117.